20080824.ba v04_n201.bam.20080824

>From ???@??? Sun Aug 24 14:49:26 2008 -0500
Date: Sun, 24 Aug 2008 14:48:44 CST
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 4201
Message-Id: <20080824204403.746DB10B0F0@srvr1.theporch.com>

BOATANCHORS Digest 4201

Topics covered in this issue include:


  1) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
  2) Re: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?
     by "Roger Dillon" <rdillontx1@verizon.net>
  3) Re: BOATANCHORS digest 4200
     by Mikhael Brown <mikhael@brown.org>
  4) Re: BOATANCHORS digest 4200
     by Gary Woods <garygarlic@earthlink.net>
  5) RE: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?
     by "Bill Hawkins" <bill@iaxs.net>
  6) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by "K0DAN" <k0dan@comcast.net>
  7) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by Richard Loken <richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca>
  8) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by "K0DAN" <k0dan@comcast.net>
  9) How do they do that?
     by John Sehring <wb0eq@yahoo.com>
 10) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
 11) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
 12) RE: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?
     by wb3fau@att.net
 13) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by wb3fau@att.net
 14) Re: How Did They Do That?
     by spr@earthlink.net
 15) R-39(x), etc., eqpt for sale
     by "Al Parker" <anchor@ec.rr.com>
 16) Wrinkle Paint:  Bike Shops?
     by "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>


---

Mime-Version: 1.0

Message-Id: <p06240808c4d2068c968a@[192.168.1.2]>
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 10:46:24 -0700
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
From: Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Hi Jerry,

****Spr comments interspersed

At 10:17 AM -0700 8/20/08, Jerry Proc wrote:
>Hi Scott,
>
In my world, using RMS means "continuous power". I have heard of phoney ratings such as "peak power" and in rare instances "peak instantaneous power". If I try and apply 200 wats of sound to any of those (200 watt rated) speakers in the 8" x 4" enclosure , I'm sure they would go up in smoke.

***You've got that right!

Now that I suspect the ratings as being "cooked up", I'm trying to understand how JVC did the calculations.
>
>Even of this amp was switching only 200 watts RMS among 6 channels,
>then the power consumption from the AC mains should be more than 160
>watts.

***That's not what I said; for a pretty loud listening level, the average power is probably something like this:

L, R channels 15W
Center channel 20W
Surround channels 5w or less
Subwoofer-depends on program, but likely 50W but not very often, so average 5W

Thus, 60W average delivered audio, which is within reason of a 160W AC mains power consumption.

The reason I assign different levels to the various channels is duty cycle. Nearly all the dialog will be in the center channel, hence it has a high duty cycle. L and R channels have mostly music and effects, loud but not always happening. Film mixing tradition uses the surrounds fairly seldom, hence low duty cycle. Subwoofer is pretty loud when going, but again has a low duty cycle.

>Perhaps I will write to JVC and find out what type of drugs the
>markering department were using when they spec'd this thing. If the
>power supply consumption is 160 watts and the PS is roughly 50%
>efficient, that would leave 80 watts or so to be shared among 6
>channels  - about 13 watts per channel which seems to be a far more
>credible arrangement especially for those very small speakers.

***That's within reason of what I estimated.  The key question is
this: is the 160W average or worst case power consumption?
>
>When I played a test movie on DVD, I could tell that the quality was
>better but for most of the programme fare arriving over the TV, its
>no better than the amp that it replaced. But then again I do not
>have have one of those "golden" audio ears that can discern the
>subtilities found in a music stream.
>
>
>--
>Regards,
>Jerry Proc
>E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com
>
>
>--- On Tue, 8/19/08, Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>>  From: Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
>>  Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
>>  To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>>  Received: Tuesday, August 19, 2008, 7:19 PM
>>  and Scott comments:
>>
>>  First, they probably lie at least some. Second, these are
>>  either
>>  class B amplifiers or class D switchmode amplifiers, which
>>  consume
>>  very little power when not delivering any. I'd guess
>>  the 160W is the
>>  power consumption playing a movie at some average volume
>>  setting in a
>>  standard sized listening room.
>>
>>  The 200W ratings might be short-term peak, the kind of
>>  thing only
>>  testable with a tone burst. I particularly expect that for
>>  the small
>>  speakers, considering that at least 75% of all power
>>  delivered to a

>> loudspeaker is dissipated at heat in the voice coil.
>>
>> And now,going past the specsmanship, are you pleased with
>> the sound?
>> As a person in the biz, I'd recommend you by or borrow
>> a low cost
>> sound level meter and set the channels so they match in
>> your
>> listening room, and then go rent a movie and enjoy!
>>
>> I've had a good surround system for years and do enjoy
>> it, although
>> the program material I most like is BBC and other British
>> mysteries,
>> many of which are mono, or almost mono.
>>
>> BTW, let me very heartily recommend to this group the
>> British Series
>> "Foyle's War." You don't see many
>> Boatanchors in it, but it's a set
>> of wonderful mysteries set during WWII on the south coast
>> of Britain.
>> Start with the episode titled "The German Woman"
>> because that's where
>> the team is assembled that's featured in the rest of
> > the stories.
>> YOu can probaly rent them at your local video store;
>> that's where I
>> got mine.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Scott
>>
>>
>> At 7:04 PM -0700 8/19/08, Jerry Proc wrote:
>> >Hello Everyone,
>> >
>> >Just as I thought I understoodheower, along comes a JVC
>> Digital
>> >Theatre System as gift from my son. According to the
>> specifications,
>> >this miracle of electronic science delivers 200 watts
>> RMS per
>> >channel @ 3 ohms to each of its 6 channels. Each
>> speaker is rated
>> >for 200 watts, even the small ones that are in an
>> 8" X 4" enclosure.

>>  >The packing box boasts a sticker stating 1200 watts RMS
>>  of audio
>>  >power!
>>  >
>>  >But the power consumption from the AC line is merely
>>  160 watts when
>>  >operating. How is this possible? What am I missing
>>  here?
>>  >
>>  >
>>  >--
>>  >Regards,
>>  >Jerry Proc
>>  >E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com
>>  >
>
>
>       _____
>Be smarter than spam. See how smart SpamGuard is at giving junk
>email the boot with the All-new Yahoo! Mail.  Click on Options in
>Mail and switch to New Mail today or register for free at
>http://mail.yahoo.ca

------------------------------
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 12:59:00 -0500
From: "Roger Dillon" <rdillontx1@verizon.net>
Subject: Re: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Message-id: <A41F19B120B1439EA795AC0BADB5BAEB@rogerPC>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=iso-8859-1; reply-type=original
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

You gotta have faith


> How  do you  know it is a tube  tester?  It  might  just be an old stove.
> Do you know  if Hi's
> Dad  was a TV repair  man?  I don't see any  boatanchors...
>
>

------------------------------
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 18:38:07 +0000 (GMT)
From: Mikhael Brown <mikhael@brown.org>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Message-ID: <1947963194.101771219257487839.JavaMail.mail@webmail10>
Subject: Re: BOATANCHORS digest 4200

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset=UTF-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<pre>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

**************************************************
*          To the SENDER of this email:          *
*------------------------------------------------*
* Please don't use HTML tags or 'rich text' here. *
*        Set your emailer to turn that off.      *
**************************************************
</pre>
 Sorry about that last post.  Forgot to delete the digest.  :
(<br /><br />Mike
Mikhael Brown<br />mikhael@brown.org<br /><br />
 
 

------------------------------
From: Gary Woods <garygarlic@earthlink.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: BOATANCHORS digest 4200
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 15:26:43 -0400
Message-ID: <4vroa4pla73p5u3bssh7b8mjcpkfguo73o@4ax.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Wed, 20 Aug 2008 18:38:07 +0000 (GMT), you wrote:

>  Sorry about that last post.  Forgot to delete the digest.  :
(<br /><br />Mike
> Mikhael Brown<br />mikhael@brown.org<br /><br />

You're still posting in HTML, which means many folks will have to go
through an extra step to read it.  Or not bother.


Gary Woods AKA K2AHC- PGP key on request, or at home.earthlink.net/~garygarlic
Zone 5/6 in upstate New York, 1420' elevation. NY WO G

------------------------------
From: "Bill Hawkins" <bill@iaxs.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: RE: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?

Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 15:50:49 -0500
Message-ID: <000001c90306$6d6bfad0$021ba8c0@cyrus>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

OK, but if you use your eyes, you can see the cables running to the
band.

It's an audio mixing console, drawn by a cartoonist. No doubt it has
tubes
in it, from the size of the cabinet.

I don't recall any drugstore testers with more than one big Pass-Fail
meter with a tiny yellow band between pass and fail.

Bill Hawkins

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dillon
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2008 12:59 PM

You gotta have faith

> How  do you  know it is a tube  tester?  It  might  just be an old
stove.
> Do you know  if Hi's
> Dad  was a TV repair  man?  I don't see any  boatanchors...


------------------------------
Message-ID: <022e01c90333$df8dd700$6601a8c0@K0DAN>
From: "K0DAN" <k0dan@comcast.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2008 21:13:05 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     format=flowed;
     charset="iso-8859-1";
     reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ya ever notice how BOSE refuses to give out their electrical specs? They
will always divert the questioner to listen to their "sound". It's OK, but
there's no opportunity for an A/B comparison. We can debate whether or not
their "sound" is any good, but they are masters at playing the marketing

game, and just simply won't get into the spec game.

I suspect they have a modest product, with modest specs, which they market aggressively. But they don't play the spec game.

I actually own some BOSE products (including one of the Lifestyle systems)...they are OK, but there's better stuff out there for the same bucks, without getting into total audiophoolery. Or maybe I was a phool buying their proeucts, but I am satisfied with what I bought. Would I do it again? Hmmmm, not sure. But this discussion of hyped up specs enticed me to comment.

73
Dan
K0DAN

----- Original Message -----
From: "Jerry Proc" <jerry7proc@yahoo.com>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2008 12:17 PM
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?

> Hi Scott,
>
> In my world, using RMS means "continuous power". I have heard of phoney
> ratings such as "peak power" and in rare instances "peak instantaneous
> power". If I try and apply 200 wats of sound to any of those (200 watt
> rated) speakers in the 8" x 4" enclosure , I'm sure they would go up in
> smoke. Now that I suspect the ratings as being "cooked up", I'm trying to
> understand how JVC did the calculations.
>
> Even of this amp was switching only 200 watts RMS among 6 channels, then
> the power consumption from the AC mains should be more than 160 watts.
> Perhaps I will write to JVC and find out what type of drugs the markering
> department were using when they spec'd this thing. If the power supply
> consumption is 160 watts and the PS is roughly 50% efficient, that would
> leave 80 watts or so to be shared among 6 channels  - about 13 watts per
> channel which seems to be a far more credible arrangement especially for
> those very small speakers.
>
> When I played a test movie on DVD, I could tell that the quality was
> better but for most of the programme fare arriving over the TV, its no
> better than the amp that it replaced. But then again I do not have have
> one of those "golden" audio ears that can discern the subtilities found in
> a music stream.
>
>

> --
> Regards,
> Jerry Proc
> E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com
>
>
> --- On Tue, 8/19/08, Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>> From: Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
>> Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
>> To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>> Received: Tuesday, August 19, 2008, 7:19 PM
>> and Scott comments:
>>
>> First, they probably lie at least some. Second, these are
>> either
>> class B amplifiers or class D switchmode amplifiers, which
>> consume
>> very little power when not delivering any. I'd guess
>> the 160W is the
>> power consumption playing a movie at some average volume
>> setting in a
>> standard sized listening room.
>>
>> The 200W ratings might be short-term peak, the kind of
>> thing only
>> testable with a tone burst. I particularly expect that for
>> the small
>> speakers, considering that at least 75% of all power
>> delivered to a
>> loudspeaker is dissipated at heat in the voice coil.
>>
>> And now,going past the specsmanship, are you pleased with
>> the sound?
>> As a person in the biz, I'd recommend you by or borrow
>> a low cost
>> sound level meter and set the channels so they match in
>> your
>> listening room, and then go rent a movie and enjoy!
>>
>> I've had a good surround system for years and do enjoy
>> it, although
>> the program material I most like is BBC and other British
>> mysteries,
>> many of which are mono, or almost mono.
>>
>> BTW, let me very heartily recommend to this group the
>> British Series

>> "Foyle's War." You don't see many
>> Boatanchors in it, but it's a set
>> of wonderful mysteries set during WWII on the south coast
>> of Britain.
>> Start with the episode titled "The German Woman"
>> because that's where
>> the team is assembled that's featured in the rest of
>> the stories.
>> YOu can probaly rent them at your local video store;
>> that's where I
>> got mine.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Scott
>>
>>
>> At 7:04 PM -0700 8/19/08, Jerry Proc wrote:
>> >Hello Everyone,
>> >
>> >Just as I thought I understoodheower, along comes a JVC
>> Digital
>> >Theatre System as gift from my son. According to the
>> specifications,
>> >this miracle of electronic science delivers 200 watts
>> RMS per
>> >channel @ 3 ohms to each of its 6 channels. Each
>> speaker is rated
>> >for 200 watts, even the small ones that are in an
>> 8" X 4" enclosure.
>> >The packing box boasts a sticker stating 1200 watts RMS
>> of audio
>> >power!
>> >
>> >But the power consumption from the AC line is merely
>> 160 watts when
>> >operating. How is this possible? What am I missing
>> here?
>> >
>> >
>> >--
>> >Regards,
>> >Jerry Proc
>> >E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com
>> >
>
>
>      ----------

> Be smarter than spam. See how smart SpamGuard is at giving junk email the
> boot with the All-new Yahoo! Mail.  Click on Options in Mail and switch to
> New Mail today or register for free at http://mail.yahoo.ca
>
>

------------------------------
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 09:52:21 -0600
From: Richard Loken <richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Wed, 20 Aug 2008, K0DAN wrote:

> Ya ever notice how BOSE refuses to give out their electrical specs? They
> will always divert the questioner to listen to their "sound". It's OK, but
> there's no opportunity for an A/B comparison. We can debate whether or not
> their "sound" is any good, but they are masters at playing the marketing
> game, and just simply won't get into the spec game.

Years ago it was demonstrated that in listener test where the speakers were
visible and you had a very small speaker and a large speaker of similar
sound quality that the listener almost always picked the small speaker as
the better speaker but if the speakers were hidden behind a curtain then the
selection was more evenly distributed or the large speaker was chosen.

I remember first seeing Bose speakers a century or two back and being very
impressed - especially when the salesman showed me the air blast coming
out of port - but did they sound as good as the $3,000.00 full size
Electrovoices down the aisle?  Yeah right.

If I want a tiny speaker then Bose would be my first choice but I have never
ever wanted a tiny speaker.

--
   Richard Loken VE6BSV, Unix System Administrator : "Anybody can be a father
   Athabasca University                            :  but you have to earn
   Athabasca, Alberta Canada                       :  the title of 'daddy'"
   ** richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca **             :  - Lynn Johnston

------------------------------
Message-ID: <029601c903ab$82f8bc80$6601a8c0@K0DAN>
From: "K0DAN" <k0dan@comcast.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 11:30:59 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     format=flowed;
     charset="iso-8859-1";
     reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Richard...

Yeh, what you describe is almost exactly what Bose still uses in their customer demos. You sit in a mock "home theater" and they show you a video with a variety of audio tracks. There are HUGE speakers all around the room. It sounds pretty decent (altho there's nothing to compare to). When the audio/video is over, the sales rep shows that the huge speakers are fake enclosures, and underneath are the tiny Bose speaker, and there's a subwoofer hidden somewhere in the room. Pretty impressive act, even though it smacks of a circus performance.

I have a Bose system in my bedroom w/ flatscreen TV and it's the right size and sounds OK. If I were to do it all over though, I'd probably buy a more generic amplifier and use Polk, Boston Acoustic, or other speakers...there's lots of good stuff out there which aggressively competes with Bose both in price and quality (IMHO).

Oh, and none of this stuff has tubes....sorry to the group for drifting off topic.

73
Dan
K0DAN

----- Original Message -----
From: "Richard Loken" <richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca>
To: "K0DAN" <k0dan@comcast.net>
Cc: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2008 10:52 AM
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?

> On Wed, 20 Aug 2008, K0DAN wrote:
>
>> Ya ever notice how BOSE refuses to give out their electrical specs? They
>> will always divert the questioner to listen to their "sound". It's OK,
>> but
>> there's no opportunity for an A/B comparison. We can debate whether or
>> not

>> their "sound" is any good, but they are masters at playing the marketing
>> game, and just simply won't get into the spec game.
>
> Years ago it was demonstrated that in listener test where the speakers
> were
> visible and you had a very small speaker and a large speaker of similar
> sound quality that the listener almost always picked the small speaker as
> the better speaker but if the speakers were hidden behind a curtain then
> the
> selection was more evenly distributed or the large speaker was chosen.
>
> I remember first seeing Bose speakers a century or two back and being very
> impressed - especially when the salesman showed me the air blast coming
> out of port - but did they sound as good as the $3,000.00 full size
> Electrovoices down the aisle?  Yeah right.
>
> If I want a tiny speaker then Bose would be my first choice but I have
> never
> ever wanted a tiny speaker.
>
> --
>   Richard Loken VE6BSV, Unix System Administrator : "Anybody can be a
> father
>   Athabasca University                            :  but you have to earn
>   Athabasca, Alberta Canada                       :  the title of 'daddy'"
>   ** richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca **             :  - Lynn Johnston
>
>

---
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 14:45:13 -0700 (PDT)
From: John Sehring <wb0eq@yahoo.com>
Subject: How do they do that?
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Message-ID: <165756.45981.qm@web45604.mail.sp1.yahoo.com>

Actually, for direct radiator, sealed box speakers, the system efficiency
(electrical to acoustic power conversion) is typically around 1%!  (Drivers in
vented boxes do better in efficiency but there are other drawbacks to consider.)

That's right, throw 99% of the electrical input power away.  (Yep, the poor voice
coil's got to lose that thermal energy or else self destruct.  However, the
reasonable peak to average ratio of most music saves it.)

It's due to the very poor mechanical-acoustic impedance match between typical
direct-radiator loudspeaker and the air.  Specifically, its radiation resistance

is very low (& impedance is highly reactive). One (difficult) way to improve the match is to use a larger radiator but that gets mighty hard, expensive & complex in a hurry.

The analogy I use is of a typical very short HF mobile antenna. Its radiation resistance is very low & (Z is vy reactive) giving very low efficiency.

I do build my own subwoofers...that's as far I think I'm capable of doing a diligent job on a speaker--I leave the woofers & tweeters of full-range systems to others. I have here a subwoofer driver. It costs $165, weighs 30 pounds (mostly in the magnet), has 12" dia, very long linear throw. Rated at 600 W peak (short term). (Exodus Audio's Shiva-X)

I probably would never put more than about 60 W rms long term into it. Music peak to average ratio is typically about 10 dB.

SPL (loudness) produced by a loudspeaker is related to its "volume velocity", i.e. how much air it can move with what velocity. Multiply its linear excursion (cone motion) by its radiating surface to get volume (2.7 liters in this case); get velocity (sine wave anyway) from frequency being reproduced.

Reproducing low (below 30 Hz) tones with realistic loudness & low distortion becomes fiendishly difficult.

For ref's, see Beranek's classic "Acoustics" for starters.

--John

---

Message-ID: <001801c903d8$50f12510$7b9e480c@KB6NAX>
From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 14:47:31 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would never have bought any Bose product but a WaveRadio was given to me as a Christmas present by an employer a few years ago. It wasn't up to what I would have wanted in a compact kitchen counter top or bedside table compact high performance radio. It couldn't produce a proper sounding bass region from it's lower intestinal tuned maze speaker system, especially at

reasonable room volume.  OK for backgound listening where Fletcher-Munson has given up hope.  AM was a miserable combination of too much sensitivity and poor cross modulation performance.  Bose could have done better if a decent audio engineer had the last say, IMHO.

Arden Allen
KB6NAX

---

Message-ID: <001901c903d8$52648b30$7b9e480c@KB6NAX>
From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 14:52:19 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It seems to me a small speaker can give decent sound UP TO A POINT.  When the job of moving air at bass frequencies depends on a small surface area moving at near wavelength distances to move that air something goes wrong that can only be corrected by turning down the volume.  So, strap then to your head if you want "mega-bass"!

Arden Allen
KB6NAX

---

From: wb3fau@att.net
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: "Bill Hawkins" <bill@iaxs.net>
Subject: RE: Has anyone noticed the tube tester?
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 22:39:21 +0000
Message-Id:
<082120082239.27899.48ADEE99000801AD00006CFB22230650629B0A02D29B9B0EBF9A0E00CC0D99
@att.net>

Hey! now  theres a great  idea  for  the Red Green Show, use an old drug store  TV tube tester  as a mixing console...

---

From: wb3fau@att.net
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: Richard Loken <richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca>, Old Tube Radios
<boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?

Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 22:51:07 +0000
Message-Id:
<082120082251.3311.48ADF15B0000146400000CEF22230650629B0A02D29B9B0EBF9A0E00CC0D99@att.net>

I don't like the Bose philosophy, but they work. They sound pretty good. I think most of us are old school enuf, to feel a large system produces realistic sound. Room treatment
is about 90% of the battle. You can make some pretty dinky speakers sound good in a well
treated room. I don't care what anyone says about bass reproduction. You need a 15inch
woofer in the right enclosure to get it right. Enuf said. russ.

---

Message-ID: <12847510.1219361014513.JavaMail.root@elwamui-ovcar.atl.sa.earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2008 19:23:34 -0400 (EDT)
From: spr@earthlink.net
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Arden,

I bought a Cambridge Soundworks radio on sale a few years ago, and it's the opposite of
what Arden describes: amazing bass for the size good value, and a very good 'wide' filter, which nicely widens the image if you 're sitting fairly close and in front of the (stereo) radio. I use it for a computer audio monitor as well as radio.

/scott

-----Original Message-----
>From: Arden Allen <gumbear@pacbell.net>
>Sent: Aug 21, 2008 5:47 PM
>To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
>Subject: Re: How Did They Do That?
>
>I would never have bought any Bose product but a WaveRadio was given to me
>as a Christmas present by an employer a few years ago. It wasn't up to what
>I would have wanted in a compact kitchen counter top or bedside table
>compact high performance radio. It couldn't produce a proper sounding bass
>region from it's lower intestinal tuned maze speaker system, especially at
>reasonable room volume. OK for backgound listening where Fletcher-Munson

>has given up hope.  AM was a miserable combination of too much sensitivity
>and poor cross modulation performance.  Bose could have done better if a
>decent audio engineer had the last say, IMHO.
>
>Arden Allen
>KB6NAX
>

------------------------------
Message-ID: <0adb01c90552$b5c42e80$6401a8c0@reloaded>
From: "Al Parker" <anchor@ec.rr.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Cc: <calltaylor@isp.com>
Subject: R-39(x), etc., eqpt for sale
Date: Sat, 23 Aug 2008 15:01:54 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     format=flowed;
     charset="iso-8859-1";
     reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi folks,
    The following items are offered for sale by a friend, Charles, WD4INP, who has limited email capabilities.  He has posted to the R-390 list in the past, but has been having isp problems, so he asked me to post for him.  If there are any errors here, they're my transcription errors, pse excuse them.
    Charles may be reached via fone at 252 524-4324, or via email at calltaylor@isp.com   If you do send an email to him, please cc me and I'll make sure he receives your msg.

================================
R-390/URR, R-390A, R-392, etc., eqpt for sale.  The modules are for R-390A unless otherwise stated.

1.  6 each RF deck, mostly intact, with all xtals and a few missing tubes.  $150 each
2.  4 each power supply assy with 26Z5's supplied.  $25 each
3.  3 main-frame assy with shorted J115 jacks.  $25 each
4.  2 each IF assy with most mechanical filters intact.  $150 each
5.  3 each AF assy with tubes missing.  $100 each
6.  1 each polished wood cabinet for R-390, etc.  $50
7.  1 each R-392, operating in 2007, supplied with Fair Radio 24vdc power supply.  $250
8.  1 each R-392, condition unknown  $150
9.  1 each R-390/URR, operating at last check in 2006.  (Has shiny finger wear around kc knob.)  $600
10.  1 each R-1279, 30-300 mc, operating in 1999 when last ckd $100

shipping not included in prices.  10% off for pickup in Grifton, NC.
==========

    Again, please reply to Charles, via fone at 252 524-4324, or via email at calltaylor@isp.com,  I'll try to follow up if you cc me in.

73,
Al, W8UT
New Bern, NC
www.boatanchors.org
www.hammarlund.info

"there is nothing -absolutely nothing- half as much worth doing as simply messing about in boats."
   Ratty, to Mole

------------------------------
Message-ID: <A66A7A3AA30549278F1ABFC851F7728C@boudreaux>
From: "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Wrinkle Paint:  Bike Shops?
Date: Sun, 24 Aug 2008 15:48:30 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
     format=flowed;
     charset="iso-8859-1";
     reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Since Harleys still use wrinkle paint on some of their bike parts, has anyone investigated getting cases wrinkle painted at custom bike shops?

----------------

http://home.netcom.com/~arc5/3.gif

------------------------------

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 4201
******************************